

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Jack L. Meador

Serial No.: 10/612,598

Filed: July 2, 2003

Docket No.: 10018099-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PREVENTING COMPREHENSION OF A PRINTED DOCUMENT

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Final Office Action mailed February 8, 2008, in which claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 26, and 28-30 were rejected and claims 6, 9, 13, 14 and 27 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-12, 15, 16-25, 27-28, and 31 are cancelled, with claims 15, 19-20, and 31 having been cancelled after being withdrawn from consideration. With this Response, claims 6, 9, 13-14, 26, and 29-30 have been amended. Claims 6, 9, 13, 14, 26, 30, and 32-34 are pending in the application and are presented for consideration and allowance.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, claims 3-4, 6, 9, and 13-14 were objected to regarding the phrase “the the at least one” in claim 3. Claims 3-4 have been canceled while the limitations of claim 3, as incorporated into independent claims 6, 9, and 13-14 have been amended to correct the “objected to” phraseology. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these claim objections.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1, 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being unpatentable over Hasegawa U.S. Patent 5, 666,191 (the Hasegawa Patent) in view of the Stringham and Newell Research Disclosure Publication 447077 (the Stringham Publication). Claims 3-4, 10, 26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hasegawa Patent in view of the Stringham Publication and further in view of Taylor U.S. Patent 5,184,849 (the Taylor Patent). Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Hasegawa Patent in view of the Stringham Publication and further in view of Regan U.S. Patent 4,786,941 (the Regan Patent).

Claims 1, 3-4, 10, 28, and 31 are canceled without prejudice. Claim 26 has been rewritten into allowable independent form, as noted below, while claim 30 is believed to be allowable based on its dependency from allowable independent claim 6, as also noted below. Finally, dependent claim 29 is believed to be allowable based on its dependency from allowable independent claim 9.

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Jack L. Meador

Serial No.: 10/612,598

Filed: July 2, 2003

Docket No.: 10018099-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PREVENTING COMPREHENSION OF A PRINTED DOCUMENT

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 10, 26, 28-29, and 30.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, claims 6, 9, 13-14, and 27 were objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended claims 6, 9, 13, and 14 to incorporate the limitations of base claim 1 and intervening claim 3. In doing so, Applicants have consolidated certain limitations to eliminate redundant phraseology while also obviating the claim objection to claim 3. Claim 30 is believed to be allowable based on its dependency from allowable independent claim 6.

Applicants have amended claim 26 by incorporating the limitations of allowable, but objected to, claim 27. In doing so, Applicants have consolidated certain limitations of claims 26 and 27 to eliminate redundant phraseology.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request confirmation of the allowance of independent claims 6, 9, 13, 14, and 26.

New Claims

Applicants have presented new claims 32-24 which provide dependent claims for newly independent claims 9, 13, and 14, respectively. These new claims recite subject matter previously appearing in claim 31, and therefore do not require further searching or consideration. Moreover, claims 32-24 are believed to be allowable based on their dependency from allowable claims 9, 13, and 14.

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Jack L. Meador

Serial No.: 10/612,598

Filed: July 2, 2003

Docket No.: 10018099-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PREVENTING COMPREHENSION OF A PRINTED DOCUMENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 6, 9, 13, 14, 26, 30, and 32-34 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 6, 9, 13, 14, 26, 30, and 32-34 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Response should be directed to Paul S. Grunzweig at Telephone No. (612) 767-2504, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Jack L. Meador et al.

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 767-2504
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: March 6, 2008

PSG:cms

/Paul S. Grunzweig/

Paul S. Grunzweig
Reg. No. 37,143